DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 4/10/08 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant asserts, on page 2 of the remarks, that in Lopez (US 7,142,318) the

proof sheet must be prepared and printed <u>before</u> the scanning process occurs and that

in Mitsubori (US 2002/0114002) the web page is printed <u>after</u> the scanning process

occurs. The examiner respectfully disagrees as Mitsubori shows a web page containing

URL text on the bottom of a recording medium that a web page has been printed to.

The web page is then scanned into the system and OCR is performed to read the URL

and perform processing steps based on the URL extracted from the scanned web page

(see Fig. 4 and paragraphs 105-107). Therefore, the web page described in Mitsubori

is printed <u>before</u> the scanning process occurs, which is similar to the process performed

by Lopez.

The applicant also asserts, on pages 3-4 of the remarks, that Lopez and

Mitsubori are not combinable because Lopez only prints certain images from a web

page and would deviate from the intended purpose if combined with Mitsubori, as

Mitsubori prints an entire web page including a URL. The examiner respectfully

disagrees as Lopez describes a scenario in which it is possible for the web page to be

accessed and extracted only contains an image. In this scenario, the entire web page

would be printed by Lopez and therefore would be combinable with the system of

Mitsubori as both references would print an entire web page and provide access data to

be used upon scanning of the printed web page (see column 10 line 28-column 11 line

33). Further, Lopez also states that a user sets the filter criteria for what type, size, etc.

of data is to be extracted from the accessed web page and therefore it is possible for a

user to select criteria that would allow all the images on a web page to be selected for

extraction and thereby print the entire webpage (see Fig. 4 and column 8 lines 34-44).

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-21 and 30-31 is maintained.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Mark R. Milia whose telephone number is (571)272-

7408. The examiner can normally be reached M-F 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David Moore can be reached at (571) 272-7437. The fax number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

                                              Mark R. Milia
                                              Examiner
                                              Art Unit 2625

/Mark R. Milia/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

        /Mark K Zimmerman/
        Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625